UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,073	12/04/2000	Erik Hennum	07042-152001	3770

24852 7590 01/14/2004

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP
IP LAW
555 BAILEY AVENUE , J46/G4
SAN JOSE, CA 95141

EXAMINER	
CHUONG, TRUC T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2174	14

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/728,073	HENNUM, ERIK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Truc T Chuong	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 October 2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 10/10/03.

2. Claims 1-45 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 29-32, and 45 are independent claims. In Amendment A, claims 1, 29, and 30 are amended. This action is made final.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 1-12, and 14-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Minard (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,020 B1).

As to claim 1, Minard teaches a method, performed in a web-based environment on a computer system, of helping a user learn to implement an application, the method comprising:

presenting an annotation page that includes one or more annotations descriptive (Structure pane shows structural information about the java code in the file, col. 11 lines 13-67) of a source file of a predetermined application, each annotation including keyword links, annotation links, detail of implementation of the application and explanation of code used in the application (method, col. 11 lines 49-65);

providing a link to a resource in an annotation (links, col. 11 lines 28-55, and fig. 4B);

if the user selects a keyword link, presenting reference documentation associated with that keyword (tag, col. 11 lines 33-41 and fig. 4B); and

if the user selects an annotation link, presenting another annotation descriptive of another source file of a predetermined application (HTML anchors and links, col. 11 lines 46-63).

As to claim 2, Minard teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising performing a predetermined application and presenting one or more annotations descriptive of the performed application in coordination with performance of the predetermined application (col. 11 lines 44-62).

As to claim 3, Minard teaches the method of claim 2 in which performing the predetermined application comprises receiving input from the user (search text, col. 12 lines 50-57).

As to claim 4, Minard teaches the method of claim 3 further comprising presenting another annotation page in coordination with performance of the predetermined application based on input from the user (col. 12 lines 33-57 and figs. 6A-C).

As to claim 5, Minard teaches the method of claim 4 in which presenting another annotation page comprises:

automatically and simultaneously calling an annotation request module including application, file, class and function names of a program unit for which detail should be displayed (col. 12 lines 1-48 and figs. 5A-C and 6A-C);

mapping the request to an annotation; and informing a browser window in the web-based environment to display the other annotation page (.java file, col. 10 lines 20-60).

As to claim 6, Minard teaches the method of claim 3 in which another annotation page is presented in coordination with performance of the predetermined application (File Type, col. 10 lines 12-60).

As to claim 7, Minard teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising automatically generating a global table of contents comprising links to annotations by parsing structured links in web pages including annotation pages (Content pane, cols. 9-10).

As to claim 8, Minard teaches the method of claim 7 in which the links in the global table of contents are synchronized with presented annotations by highlighting links corresponding to a current annotation page (highlight, col. 11 lines 24-41 and fig. 4B).

As to claim 9, Minard teaches the method of claim 8 in which the global table of contents is presented in a first frame of a first browser window, the annotation page is presented in a second frame of the first browser window, and the predetermined application is performed in a second browser window (figs. 4B, 5A-C).

As to claim 10, Minard teaches the method of claim 2 in which performing the predetermined application comprises launching a Java applet or application (applet, col. 6 lines 41-65).

As to claim 11, Minard teaches the method of claim 10 in which launching the Java applet or application comprises calling a Java application programming interface to ask a web browser to show the annotation page (Doc tab, col. 10 lines 1-15, 41-56 and figs. 4A-B).

As to claim 12, Minard teaches the method of claim 2 in which performing the predetermined application comprises downloading a hyper-text markup language page containing a Java applet (loading a project, Help menu of Memu commands in col. 6, File Type, col. 10 lines 27-50).

As to claim 14, Minard teaches the method of claim 13 in which the application returns a hyper-text markup language page that includes JavaScript to ask a web browser to display the one or more annotations (JavaScript, col. 5 lines 16-31).

As to claim 15, Minard teaches the method of claim 2 in which the annotation page is presented in a first browser window and the predetermined application is performed in a second browser window (col. 11 lines 28-40 and figs. 4A-B, 5C, and 6A).

As to claim 16, Minard teaches the method of claim 1 in which application implementation detail includes text descriptive of the application, fragments of source code from the application, or both (figs. 5A-C).

As to claim 17, Minard teaches the method of claim 16 in which source code fragments are imported directly from the source code file of the presented application (editing in the Content pane, col. 9 lines 64-67, col. 10 lines 1-15 and figs. 4A-B).

As to claim 18, Minard teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising automatically generating the annotation page descriptive of the source code file of a predetermined application (col. 11 lines 46-56).

As to claim 19, Minard teaches the method of claim 18 in which generating the annotation page comprises:

receiving a source code file that has embedded text marked up with instructions (col. 7 lines 60-67 and figs. 5B-C);

parsing the source code to determine a structure of the predetermined application (Project Notes, Things to do of fig. 5B); and

generating one or more annotations based on the predetermined application structure and instructions (Help menu in Menu commands of col. 6, col. 13 lines 19-25 and figs. 5A-C).

As to claim 20, Minard teaches the method of claim 19 in which generating the annotation page comprises:

generating one or more annotation links for navigating the annotations of the predetermined application (Navigation pane, col. 8 lines 63-67, col. 9 lines 1-62);

generating application implementation detail based on the embedded information (Commands menu, col. 6); and

generating one or more keyword links for reference documentation (Elements 410, 411, and 430 of fig. 4A).

As to claim 21, Minard teaches the method of claim 20 in which generating the annotation page comprises highlighting the keyword links and the annotation links in the annotation page (highlight, col. 11 lines 24-41 and fig. 4A-B).

As to claim 22, Minard teaches the method of claim 19 further comprising automatically updating the annotation page descriptive of the source code file of the predetermined application when an updated source code file is received (update display, col. 13 lines 57-67 and col. 14 lines 1-7).

As to claim 23, Minard teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising automatically generating a global table of contents by parsing the plurality of annotations for annotation links (col. 8 lines 40-51 and fig. 4A).

As to claim 24, Minard teaches the method of claim 23 further comprising providing the global table of contents, in which the global table of contents comprises links to annotations (col. 11 lines 56-60).

As to claim 25, Minard teaches the method of claim 23 further comprising generating a local table of contents, in which the local table of contents comprises links to web pages including annotation pages relating to an application (tabs and subobjects, col. 13 lines 39-55).

As to claim 26, Minard teaches the method of claim 25 further comprising providing the local table of contents when a local link in the global table of contents is selected (Hierarchy context, col. 12 lines 34-48).

As to claim 27, Minard teaches the method of claim 1 in which the presented annotation page is descriptive of the performed application and the annotation page is presented in coordination with performance of the predetermined application (Help menu, col. 6 lines 58-64).

As to claim 28, Minard teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:

generating a source code file stripped of annotation mark up, the generated source code file including source code of the application but not including text from the annotations (tracing into code, col. 6 lines 49-55);

presenting the stripped source code file (HTML source code, col. 10 lines 10-19); and

permitting the user to edit the stripped source code file (ready for editing, col. 9 lines 64-67).

As to claim 29, it is individually similar in scope to claim 1 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 30, Minard teaches a method, performed in a web-based environment on a computer system, for teaching a user to implement an application, the method comprising:

automatically assembling a global table of contents based on content in the environment, the global table of contents including a plurality of links to content within the environment (col. 10 lines 1-15);

providing the global table of contents (File Types, col. 10 lines 24-60);

generating a local table of contents that includes links to content that orient the user within a local topic (File Type, col. 10 lines 15-59); and

permitting the user to select links from the local table of contents to access local topics (select tools of a class, col. 10 lines 50-59).

As to claim 31, a method, performed in a web-based environment on a computer system, of teaching a user to implement an application, the method comprising:

providing a plurality of predefined interactive examples; and performing one or more of the predefined interactive examples in response to user selection (UI appearance, col. 9 line 63-col. 10 line 59);

presenting one or more annotations descriptive of the performed interactive example in coordination with performance of the predefined interactive example (different types of files, col. 10 lines 24-59); and

allowing the user to selectively explore different aspects of the performed interactive example, the annotations, or both (different "flavor", col. 11 lines 46-55).

As to claim 32, this is a system claim of method claims 1 and 31. Note the rejections of claims 1 and 31 above.

As to claim 33, Minard teaches the system of claim 32 further comprising a utility through which the user can access source code associated with a predefined interactive application (col. 11 lines 46-56 and figs. 4A-B).

As to claim 34, the system of claim 33 in which the utility enables the user to view or copy a predefined interactive application's source code (Edit menu of Menu commands in col. 6).

As to claim 35, this is a system claim of method claim 16. Note the rejection of claim 16 above.

As to claim 36, this is a system claim of method claim 20. Note the rejection of claim 20 above.

As to claim 37, Manard teaches the system of claim 32 further comprising a web-browser window that includes a framework that comprises:

a content frame that displays the annotations; a framework applet that displays a navigation bar; and a table of contents frame that displays a table of contents hierarchy of links (col. 8 lines 41-67, cols. 9-10, and figs. 4A-B).

As to claim 38, this is a system of method claim 10. Note the rejection of claim 10 above.

As to claim 39, Minard teaches the system of claim 37 in which a Java Script automatically determines whether the framework is present in the web browser window, and if the framework is present, notifies the framework applet about the content in the framework (Structure pane displays the structure of the document if available, col. 8 lines 39-62).

As to claim 40, Minard teaches the system of claim 39 in which the table of contents automatically highlights a link in the hierarchy based on the content in the framework (highlight, col. 11 lines 28-45 and fig. 4B).

As to claim 41, Minard teaches the system of claim 40 in which the user accesses an annotation page by selecting a link in the table of content's hierarchy (hierarchy context, col. 12 lines 33-48 and figs. 6B-C).

As to claim 42, Minard teaches the system of claim 40 in which the user accesses an annotation page by interacting with the navigation bar (tool bar buttons, col. 9 lines 1-12).

As to claim 43, Minard teaches the system of claim 40 in which the table of contents highlights the hierarchy based on an annotation page displayed in the content frame (col. 11 lines 28-45).

As to claim 44, Minard teaches the system of claim 37 in which the table of contents is dismissible or resizable (resize, col. 10 lines 65-67).

As to claim 45, Minard teaches a web-based computer system for teaching a user to implement an application, the system comprising:

a web-browser window that includes a content frame, a framework applet, and a table of contents frame that displays a global table of contents hierarchy of links related to content in the content frame (AppBrowser, cols. 8-12 and figs. 4A-7C);

one or more annotations displayed in the content frame, each annotation describing a predefined interactive application and including links to other content (different types of files, col. 10 lines 24-59); and

a table of contents window that displays a local table of contents hierarchy of links related to local content in the displayed annotation (col. 9 lines 1-12, col. 10 lines 1-60, and figs. 4A-B).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minard (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,020 B1) in view of Beall et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,169,992 B1).

As to claim 13, Minard teaches the method of claim 2 in which performing the predetermined application (see claim 1 above), but Minard does not teach the method of sending a common gateway interface request to a web server that launches the application in a window in the web-based environment. Beall clearly teaches CGI standard request from a World Wide Web to run a CGI program (col. 22 lines 61-67). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to have the Beall's CGI standard request in Minard's AppBrowser to perform the remote procedure call to be transmitted over the Internet using an http protocol (col. 23 lines 5-8) provides easy to access resources available in different environments, efficient and speedy remote access over communications.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed in Amendment A have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued the following:

a. Minard does not teach or suggest "presenting an annotation page."

b. Minard does not disclose "explanation of the code."

c. Minard does not teach "a local table of contents."

d. Minard does not disclose "providing an interactive example."

e. Minard does not show "different annotations are automatically provided in response to selective execution of a predefined interactive application."

f. Minard does not disclose "a web-browser that includes a content frame, a framework applet and a table of contents frames."

g. Beall does not suggest the desirability of combining a CGI.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (a), Minard clearly teaches that Structure pane shows the structural information about the java code in the file (col. 11 lines 13-67).

Per (b), Minard clearly shows an explanation of code (the structural information about the java code, col. 11 lines 13-67).

Per (c), Minard teaches a local table of contents (File Type, col. 10 lines 15-59).

Per (d), Minard teaches an interactive example (col. 9 line 63-col. 10 line 59).

Per (e), Minard teaches different annotations are automatically provided in response to selective execution of a predefined interactive application (col. 6 line 8-col. 7 line 51).

Per (f), Minard teaches AppBrowser (AppBrowser, col. 8 line 1 col. 12 line 26, and figs. 4A-7C).

Per (g), in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some

teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Beall's CGI standard request in Minard's AppBrowser to perform the remote procedure call to be transmitted over the Internet using standard http protocol (col. 23 lines 5-8) provides easy to access resources available in different environments, efficient and speedy remote access over communications (col. 3 lines 25-59).

Conclusion

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Truc T. Chuong

12/31/03

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100